

## **REMARKS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 7, 20, 26, 35-38, and 43 have been amended through this Response. Claims 6 and 42 have been canceled. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims 1-5, 7-41, and 43-52 are respectfully requested.

### **I. Claim Objections**

Claim 1 is objected to because of informalities. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the informality.

The Examiner noted that claims 35-38 appear to depend upon incorrect parent claims (Office action 01/24/2007, page 2). Claims 35-36 have been amended to depend on claim 26; claims 37-38 have been amended to depend on claim 36.

### **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-28, 30-37 and 39-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,836). Claim 1 has been amended with the subject matter of claim 6, and claim 6 has been canceled. Claim 26 has been amended with the subject matter of claim 42, and claim 42 has been canceled. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

#### **A. Independent Claim 1**

Bruck does not disclose or teach, "wherein the step of driving the display device according to the determined characteristic further includes the steps of receiving a TV signal at a network client device, processing the TV signal, and *transmitting a video output signal* according to the first video interface specification *and* according to at least *one parameter of the TV signal*" as recited in independent claim 1. The Office action on page 5 refers to Fig. 2B: 13, 29, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 12 as disclosing these elements.

According to Bruck in col. 6, lines 24-27, "The Web browser functions of the present invention are implemented by application software 31. FIG. 2B illustrates the functional relationships between the various components of application software 31." Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, the Bruck box 10 includes the various components of the application software 31 illustrated in Fig. 2B, Bruck fails to teach transmitting a *video output signal* according to a video interface specification *and* according to at least *one parameter of the TV signal*. Therefore, Bruck does not disclose or teach the steps of receiving a TV signal at a network client device, processing the TV signal, and *transmitting a video output signal* according to the first video interface specification *and* according to at least *one parameter of the TV signal* as described in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 1 be withdrawn. Because independent claim 1 is allowable over Bruck, dependent claims 2-5 and 7-24 are allowable as a matter of law.

#### **B. Independent Claim 25**

With regards to independent claim 25, Bruck does not disclose or teach, "cycling through a plurality of video formats, each part of the cycle including a *predetermined time duration*". The Office action on page 10 refers to col. 12, lines 15-18, and user input: col. 11, lines 17, 28, 39, 52, and 63 as disclosing these elements.

Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, Bruck discloses user input to adjust the display settings of a television display in order to optimize the display of web pages, Bruck fails to teach cycling through a plurality of video formats where each part of the cycle includes a *predetermined time duration* because the user in Bruck determines whether and when to continue to the next screen. Therefore, Bruck does not disclose or teach cycling through a plurality of video formats, each part of the cycle including a *predetermined time duration* as described in claim 25.

Further with regards to claim 25, Bruck does not disclose or teach "*driving the display device* according to the at least one determined characteristic *and* according to *at least one parameter of a received TV signal* to present images on a display screen". The Office action on page 11 refers to col. 12, line 15-18, and TV signal parameter: Fig. 2B, 29 as disclosing these elements.

Bruck discloses in col. 6, lines 24-33, "The Web browser functions of the present invention are implemented by application software 31. FIG. 2B illustrates the functional relationships between the various components of application software 31. ... The client system receives Web pages over network connection 29 in the form of HTML documents." Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, the Bruck box 10 includes the various components of the application software 31 illustrated in Fig. 2B and receives Web pages over the network connection 29, Bruck fails to teach driving the television set 12 according to at least one parameter of a TV signal. Therefore, Bruck does not disclose or teach *driving the display device* according to the at least one determined characteristic *and* according to *at least one parameter of the TV signal* as described in claim 25. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 25 be withdrawn.

### **C. Independent Claim 26**

With regards to independent claim 26, Bruck does not disclose or teach, "wherein the processor is further configured with the display logic to effect *driving of the display device* according to *at least one parameter of a TV signal*." The Office action on page 8 refers to col. 12, line 15-18, and TV signal parameter: Fig. 2B, 29 as disclosing these elements.

Bruck discloses in col. 6, lines 24-33, "The Web browser functions of the present invention are implemented by application software 31. FIG. 2B illustrates the functional relationships between the various components of application software 31. ... The client system receives Web pages over network connection 29 in the form of HTML documents." Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, the Bruck box 10 includes the various

components of the application software 31 illustrated in Fig. 2B and receives Web pages over the network connection 29, Bruck fails to teach driving the television set 12 according to at least one parameter of a TV signal. Therefore, Bruck does not disclose or teach that a processor is further configured with the display logic to effect *driving of the display device* according to at least *one parameter of the TV signal* as described in claim 26.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 26 be withdrawn. Because independent claim 26 is allowable over Bruck, dependent claims 27-41 and 43-48 are allowable as a matter of law.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103**

#### **A. Rejection of Claims 4 and 29**

Claims 4 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruck. Applicants submit that dependent claims 4 and 29 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that claim 4 contains all the features and elements of independent claim 1 and that claim 29 contains all the features and elements of independent claim 26, which Applicants believe to be allowable. For at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 4 and 29 be withdrawn.

#### **B. Rejection of Claims 13 and 38**

Claims 13 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruck in view of Elswick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,791,620). Applicants submit that dependent claims 13 and 38 are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that claim 13 contains all the features and elements of independent claim 1 and that claim 38 contains all the features and elements of independent claim 26, which Applicants believe to be allowable. For at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 13 and 38 be withdrawn.

### C. Rejection of Claims 49-52

Claims 49-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruck view of Gove et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,398,071). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

None of the references disclose or suggest, "wherein the processor is further configured with the display logic to, *responsive to the user input, determine the de-interlacing capability of the display device*" as recited in claim 49. The Office Action states on page 13, "Bruck does not explicitly disclose that the determined capability is [the] display device's de-interlacing capability." However, the Office Action refers to Gove as disclosing, "a similar system for determining preferred display performance using a format detector that is integrated with motion detection logic used for de-interlacing algorithms of standard television formats so as to permit real-time switching to whatever pixel processing algorithm is most appropriate for the data being received (col. 1 line 65 – col. 2, line 2)."

Even if, assuming for the sake of argument, the Gove processing system 25 performs movie motion compensation or deinterlacing based on the format of the incoming data detected by the format detector 24, Gove does not disclose or suggest determining the *de-interlacing capability of the display device*. Also, even if, assuming for the sake of argument, the Gove processor system 25 performs movie motion compensation based on the control signal from the format detector 24, Gove still does not determine the *de-interlacing capability of the display device*. Thus, Gove fails to disclose or suggest that a processor is configured with the display logic to, *responsive to the user input, determine the de-interlacing capability of the display device* as described in claim 49. Therefore, even if combined, the references do not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 49.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection to claim 49 be withdrawn. Because independent claim 49 is allowable over Bruck, dependent claims 50-52 are allowable as a matter of law.

**CONCLUSION**

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby respectfully requested. Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all finding of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all finding of well-known art and official notice, and similarly interpreted statements, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500 to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/sbg/  
Suzanne B. Gagnon  
Registration No. 48,924

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,  
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1750  
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500